

54



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/504,531	02/15/2000	Ilan Caron	1018.070US1	8026

23441 7590 02/13/2003

LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL DRYJA
704 228TH AVENUE NE
PMB 694
SAMMAMISH, WA 98074

EXAMINER

CAO, DIEM K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/504,531	CARON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Diem K Cao	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Application filed on 2/15/2000.
2. Claims 1-47 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-24, 26-37 and 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piskiel et al. (U.S. 5,893,911) in view of Cohen (U.S. 5,881,315).

As to claim 1, Piskiel teaches (col. 7, line 45 – col. 11, line 2) a message (a published message), a queue (queue 212), one rule (rule) has a condition satisfied by the message (when all clauses of a rule evaluate to boolean TRUE), performing an action (action) associated with the rule (each row of action table 344 ... table 328).

However, Piskiel does not explicitly teach a trigger associated with a queue. Cohen teaches (col. 5, line 50 – col. 11, line 8) a trigger (event filter group) associated with a queue (input queue 74). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Cohen to the system of Piskiel because it would provide a method to filter the events/messages to determine whether particular events/messages are sent to one or more consumers.

As to claim 2, Piskiel does not explicitly teach one trigger comprises a plurality of ordered triggers. Cohen teaches (col. 5, line 50 – col. 8, line 43) one trigger comprises a plurality of ordered triggers (“one event filter group per registered event consumer” and “multiple event

consumers are interested in the same event data”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teaching of Cohen to the system of Piskiel because it would provide a method to let multiple consumers to receive the same data.

As to claim 3, Piskiel teaches (col. 9, line 35 – col. 10, line 16) activating each of at least one module (action) associated with the rule.

As to claim 4, Piskiel does not explicitly teach each module comprises one of a software component; and an executable program file. However, Piskiel teaches actions may be sending messages to subscribing programs, or initiating execution of a new application, or terminating execution of an application (col. 9, line 35 0 col. 10, line 16). It would have been obvious software component and/or executable program file are used in order to carry out the action.

As to claim 5, Piskiel teaches (col. 9, line 35 – col. 10, line 16) passing the message to the module (send a transaction message to ... application).

As to claim 6, Piskiel does not explicitly teach each trigger has an enabled state and a disabled state, checking for the message received in the queue only when the trigger is in the enabled state. Cohen teaches user can create and modify trigger (col. 8, line 1-10). It would have been obvious the user could also disable the trigger and not to receive any more messages/event type, thus the message would not be checked when the trigger is disable. It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Cohen to the system of Piskiel because it would provide a method to the user to create and/or modify the trigger.

As to claim 7, Piskiel teaches a short-circuit rule, such that satisfaction by the message of the condition of the rule causes checking for satisfaction of the condition of each of any non-checked rule to stop (the rule clause is ignored for ... table entry; col. 8, lines 51-67).

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 8, Piskiel does not explicitly teach a destructive rule, such that satisfaction by the message of the condition of the rule removes the message from the queue. Cohen teaches a destructive rule, such that satisfaction by the message of the condition of the rule removes the message from the queue (when that count reaches zero ... deleted from the active queue; col. 9, line 47 – col. 10, line 27).

As to claim 9, Piskiel teaches checking is performed in a serial manner (Element 800 is first ... published message; col. 16, lines 27 - 67).

As to claim 10, Piskiel does not teach checking is performed in a concurrent manner. Piskiel teaches checking is performed in a serial manner (Element 800 is first ... published message; col. 16, lines 27 - 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Piskiel to have the checking performed in the serial manner.

As to computer product claim 11, it corresponds to the method claim of claim 1.

As to claims 12-19, see rejections of claims 3-10 above.

As to claims 20 and 36, see rejections of claims 1 and 6 above. Cohen further teaches (col. 5, line 50 – col. 6, line 24) a trigger store (Event Filter Database 46), a trigger service (Event Management Service).

As to claim 21, Cohen teaches the trigger store corresponds to a particular computer and references each of the at least one trigger within a trigger database (Event Filter Database 46; col. 5, line 50 – col. 6, line 24).

As to claim 22, Piskiel teaches the queue comprises data stored on a computer-readable medium (queue 212; col. 7, line 45 – col. 10, line 54).

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 23, Cohen teaches the trigger store comprises data stored on a computer-readable medium (Event Filter Database 46; col. 5, line 50 – col. 6, line 58).

As to claim 24, Cohen teaches the trigger service comprises a computer program executed by a processor from a computer-readable medium (EMS; col. 5, line 50 – col. 6, line 58).

As to claim 26, see rejection of claim 2 above.

As to claim 27, Piskiel teaches (col. 9, lines 1-67) the trigger service is designed to perform the action associated with a rule by activating each of the module associated with the rule (The action table ... file or database).

As to claim 28, Piskiel teaches (col. 9, lines 1-67) further comprising one module, such that the at least one module associated with the rule as activated by the trigger service are selected from the at least one module rule (The action table ... file or database).

As to claims 29-30, see rejections of claims 4-5 above.

As to claims 31-34, see rejections of claims 7-10 above.

As to claim 35, Piskiel teaches (Fig. 1) the system comprises at least one computer.

As to claim 37, see rejection of claim 21 above.

As to claims 39-47, see rejection of claims 26-34 above.

5. Claims 25 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piskiel et al. (U.S. 5,893,911) in view of Cohen (U.S. 5,881,315) further in view of Moore et al. (U.S. 5,630,127).

As to claims 25 and 38, Piskiel does not explicitly teach a trigger manager designed to provide for creating, editing and deleting triggers in a visual, non-programming manner. Cohen

Art Unit: 2126

teaches the trigger is created and modified by the user using the Consumer API (col. 8, lines 1-10). Moore teaches (col. 5, line 31 – col. 11, line 43) a trigger manager (the GRMS 108) designed to provide for creating, editing and deleting triggers in a visual, non-programming manner. It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Moore to the system of Piskiel and Cohen because it would provide a method for a business professional, and not a software expert, can create and modified the triggers.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Gossler et al. (U.S. 5,799,173) teaches “Dynamic Workload Balancing”.
- Tani (U.S. 6,046,780) teaches “Broadcasting Facility Management System and Method”.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (703) 305-5220. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00AM - 5:00PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7238.
- OFFICIAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7239.
- NON-OFFICIAL/DRAFT faxes should not be signed, please send to (703) 746-7140.

Application/Control Number: 09/504,531

Page 7

Art Unit: 2126

Diem Cao

February 3, 2003



ALVIN OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100